

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to an Office Action mailed February 15, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended herein.

Claims 1-4, 7-25, and 27-33 remain in the present application. Claims 5, 6, and 26 have been cancelled without prejudice.

In the February 15, 2006 Office Action, claims 1-5, 12-14, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,525,516 issued to Schultz et al. (hereinafter "Schultz"). Claim 5 has been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection of such claim moot. Applicant has selectively amended the remaining claims to clearly distinguish over Schultz. For example, amended claim 1 includes:

An apparatus comprising:

a voltage regulator having an output path to supply a voltage to power an electrical component, a power consumption rate of the electrical component to fluctuate during operation;

a board-sense circuit to sense a first feedback signal at a first sense location on the output path, said board-sense circuit comprising a transient filter to capture steady-state feedback; and

a load-sense circuit to sense a second feedback signal at a second sense location on the output path, said load-sense circuit comprising a steady state filter to capture transient feedback, said steady-state feedback and said transient feedback to at least partially represent fluctuations in the power consumption rate, and said voltage regulator to adjust the voltage based at least in part on a combination of the steady-state feedback and the transient feedback.

In amended claim 1, a voltage regulator adjusts its output voltage based on a combination to two types of feedback, steady state feedback and transient feedback. The two types of feedback are sensed at two different locations along an output path between the voltage regulator and an electrical component powered by the regulator. That is, the steady-state feedback is sensed at one

location on the output path, and the transient feedback is sensed at another location on the output path.

Schultz, in contrast, simply describes differential sensing. That is, in Schultz, one feedback line is used to measure the output voltage of the voltage regulator, and the other feedback line is used to measure the ground voltage at the device being powered by the regulator (Schultz: col. 6, lines 50-53). The voltage regulator uses the difference between the two feedback voltages to control the output voltage (Schultz: col. 6, lines 53-55). In other words, Schultz has nothing whatsoever to do with different types of feedback, but instead simply describes measuring a feedback voltage across differential sense points.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Schultz does not suggest, disclose, or enable regulating voltage based on a combination of steady-state feedback from one sense location and transient feedback from another sense location, as claimed in amended claim 1.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is patentable over Schultz.

Applicant submits that the reasoning presented above with respect to amended claim 1 similarly applies to claims 2-4, 12-14, 24, and 25, as amended. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-4, 12-14, 24, and 25 are likewise patentable over Schultz.

In the February 15, 2006 Office Action, claims 6-11, 15-23, and 26-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Schultz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,262,566 issued to Dinh (hereinafter "Dinh"). Claims 6 and 26 have been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection of such claims moot. Applicant respectfully submits that the reasoning presented above with respect to Schultz similarly applies to claims 7-11, 15-23, and 27-33, as amended. Dinh was cited for teaching "transient type filters for the feedback signal." Assuming purely for the sake of argument that the Office Action is correct with respect to the teachings of Dinh, Applicant respectfully submits that Dinh fails to cure the

deficiencies of Schultz as discussed above. Specifically, Dinh fails to suggest, disclose, or enable regulating voltage based on a combination of steady-state feedback from one sense location and transient feedback from another sense location. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7-11, 15-23, and 27-33, as amended, are patentable over Schultz in view of Dinh.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4, 7-25, and 27-33 are now in a condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of such claims.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to our Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

INTEL CORPORATION

Date: May 15, 2006



Robert A. Diehl
Reg. No. 40,992

INTEL LEGAL
SC4-202
P.O. Box 5326
Santa Clara, CA 95056-5326
Phone: (503) 712-1880
FAX: (503) 264-1729

- 11 -

Atty. Docket No.: P15955
Application No.: 10/692,552